POULSEN Mike From:

Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA To:

Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; TOEPEL Kathryn; pi.bridgen@eiltd.net Cc:

RE: Issues for Development of PRGs Subject:

Date: 05/31/2006 02:49 PM

Dana -

This will help us focus on the issues. I have a few comments, which I've included by issue number.

- 2) and 3) You might want to emphasize the word "screening" here. The bigger issue may be whether we need/want to do a risk assessment on TZW.
- 9) The new early-life guidelines will apply to surface water exposure as well as sediment.
- 10) If the managers decide to include this pathway, I think we should consider all the relevant PBTs, including dioxins and DDTs.

----Original Message-

----Original Message---From: Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 1:22 PM
To: TOEPEL Kathryn; POULSEN Mike; pj.bridgen@eiltd.net
Cc: blischke.eric@epamail.epa.gov; humphrey.chip@epamail.epa.gov;

davoli.dana@epamail.epa.gov Subject: Issues for Development of PRGs

Attached is a summary of the HH Risk Issues. As requested by Eric, I attempted to define which issues need to be resolved for development of initial PRGs, whether we can be directive about the PRGs (including direction on which PRGs to use), and other non-PRG issues that will need to be resolved for the RD2 report and/or the HHRA. Please review this and get back to everyone on the list today with any recommended changes. I am especially interested in what you think are issues that we need to resolve for the RD2 Report versus those for the HHRA. For example, I thought we needed to resolve the diving issue for the RD2 report as it might ID additional chemicals of concern for water. But I left breast-feeding for the HHRA as I don't think it will change the chemicals of concern or the need for additional sampling. But I'm open to any and all changes!!!

Sorry for such a short review time

(See attached file: 20060531 Davoli Summary of Issues.xls)